**Practitioner's Docket No. NVIDP380/P002194** *PATENT*

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re application of: Christine Odero et al.

Application No.: 09/932,262 Group No.: 2173
Filed: August 17, 2001 Examiner: Roswell, Michael
For: SYSTEM, METHOD AND COMPUTER PROGRAM PRODUCT FOR A MULTIFUNCTION TOOLBAR FOR INTERNET BROWSERS

**Mail Stop Appeal Briefs – Patents**
**Commissioner for Patents**
**P.O. Box 1450**
**Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**

**TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF**
**(PATENT APPLICATION--37 C.F.R. § 41.37)**

1. This brief is in furtherance of the Notice of Appeal, filed in this case on 10/15/2007, and in response to the Notice of Panel Decision from Pre-Appeal Brief Review, mailed 01/25/2008.

2. STATUS OF APPLICANT

This application is on behalf of other than a small entity.

3. FEE FOR FILING APPEAL BRIEF

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 41.20(b)(2), the fee for filing the Appeal Brief is:

| | |
|---|---|
| other than a small entity | $510.00 |
| **Appeal Brief fee due** | **$510.00** |

4. EXTENSION OF TERM

The proceedings herein are for a patent application and the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 apply.

Applicant believes that no extension of term is required. However, this conditional petition is being made to provide for the possibility that applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for a petition and fee for extension of time.

5. TOTAL FEE DUE

The total fee due is:

| | |
|---|---|
| Appeal brief fee | $510.00 |
| Extension fee (if any) | $0.00 |
| **TOTAL FEE DUE** | **$510.00** |

6. FEE PAYMENT

Authorization is hereby made to charge the amount of $510.00 to Deposit Account No. 50-1351 (Order No. NVIDP380).

7. FEE DEFICIENCY

If any additional extension and/or fee is required, and if any additional fee for claims is required, charge Deposit Account No. 50-1351 (Order No. NVIDP380).

Date: February 25, 2008

/KEVINZILKA/
Signature of Practitioner

Reg. No.: 41,429
Tel. No.: 408-971-2573
Customer No.: 75359

Kevin J. Zilka
Zilka-Kotab, PC
P.O. Box 721120
San Jose, CA 95172-1120

**PATENT**

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

| | |
|---|---|
| In re application of: | |
| Odero et al. | Group Art Unit: 2173 |
| Application No. 09/932,262 | Examiner: Roswell, Michael |
| Filed: 08/17/2001 | Atty. Docket No. NVIDP380/P002194 |
| For: SYSTEM, METHOD AND COMPUTER PROGRAM PRODUCT FOR A MULTIFUNCTION TOOLBAR FOR INTERNET BROWSERS | Date: 02/25/2008 |

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**ATTENTION: Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences**

**APPEAL BRIEF (37 C.F.R. § 41.37)**

This brief is in furtherance of the Notice of Appeal, filed in this case on 10/15/2007, and in response to the Notice of Panel Decision from Pre-Appeal Brief Review, mailed 01/25/2008.

The fees required under § 1.17, and any required petition for extension of time for filing this brief and fees therefor, are dealt with in the accompanying TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF.

This brief contains these items under the following headings, and in the order set forth below (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(i)):

I REAL PARTY IN INTEREST
II RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES
III STATUS OF CLAIMS
IV STATUS OF AMENDMENTS
V SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

VI GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

VII ARGUMENT

VIII CLAIMS APPENDIX

IX EVIDENCE APPENDIX

X RELATED PROCEEDING APPENDIX

The final page of this brief bears the practitioner's signature.

## I REAL PARTY IN INTEREST (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(i))

The real party in interest in this appeal is NVIDIA International, Inc.

## II RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c) (1)(ii))

With respect to other prior or pending appeals, interferences, or related judicial proceedings that will directly affect, or be directly affected by, or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal, there are no other such appeals, interferences, or related judicial proceedings.

A Related Proceedings Appendix is appended hereto.

## III STATUS OF CLAIMS (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c) (1)(iii))

### A. TOTAL NUMBER OF CLAIMS IN APPLICATION

Claims in the application are: 1-41

### B. STATUS OF ALL THE CLAIMS IN APPLICATION

1. Claims withdrawn from consideration: None
2. Claims pending: 1-41
3. Claims allowed: None
4. Claims rejected: 1-41
5. Claims cancelled: None

### C. CLAIMS ON APPEAL

The claims on appeal are: 1-41

See additional status information in the Appendix of Claims.

## IV STATUS OF AMENDMENTS (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(iv))

As to the status of any amendment filed subsequent to final rejection, there are no such amendments after final.

## V SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(v))

With respect to a summary of Claim 1, as shown in Figures 8-11, a method provides a multifunction toolbar for a web browser. In use, a toolbar (e.g. see item 800 of Figure 8, etc.) is displayed over a web browser (e.g. see item 1000 of Figure 10, etc.) on a computer (e.g. see operation 1102 of Figure 11, etc.). Additionally, the toolbar is linked to a portal of a user (e.g. see operation 1104 of Figure 11, etc.) on a remote server coupled to the computer via a network. Further, the portal is for aggregating content selected by the user. Further still, a bucket (e.g. see item 914 of Figure 9, etc.) is presented on the toolbar (e.g. see operation 1106 of Figure 11, etc.). Also, it is recognized when the user selects content on a website displayed on the web browser and drops the content in the bucket (e.g. see operation 1108 of Figure 11, etc.). In addition, the selected content is added to the portal (e.g. see operation 1110 of Figure 11, etc.). See, for example, page 4, lines 3-7, 10-15, and 17-18 et al.

With respect to a summary of Claim 10, as shown in Figures 8, 10 and 11, a computer program product provides a multifunction toolbar for a web browser. The computer program product comprises computer code for displaying a toolbar (e.g. see item 800 of Figure 8, etc.) over a web browser (e.g. see item 1000 of Figure 10, etc.) on a computer (e.g. see operation 1102 of Figure 11, etc.). Additionally, the computer program product comprises computer code for linking the toolbar to a portal of a user (e.g. see operation 1104 of Figure 11, etc.) on a remote server coupled to the computer via a network. Further, the portal is for aggregating content selected by the user. Further still, the computer program product comprises computer code for presenting a bucket (e.g. see item 914 of Figure 9, etc.) on the toolbar (e.g. see operation 1106 of Figure 11, etc.). Also, the computer program product comprises computer code for recognizing when the user selects content on a website displayed on the web browser and drops the content in the bucket (e.g. see operation 1108 of Figure 11, etc.). In addition, the computer program product comprises computer code for adding the selected content to the portal (e.g. see operation 1110 of Figure 11, etc.). See, for example, page 4, lines 3-7, 10-15, and 17-18 et al.

With respect to a summary of Claim 19, as shown in Figures 8-11, a system provides a multifunction toolbar for a web browser. The system comprises logic for displaying a toolbar

(e.g. see item 800 of Figure 8, etc.) over a web browser (e.g. see item 1000 of Figure 10, etc.) on a computer (e.g. see operation 1102 of Figure 11, etc.). Additionally, the system comprises logic for linking the toolbar to a portal of a user (e.g. see operation 1104 of Figure 11, etc.) on a remote server coupled to the computer via a network. Further, the portal is for aggregating content selected by the user. Further still, the system comprises logic for presenting a bucket (e.g. see item 914 of Figure 9, etc.) on the toolbar (e.g. see operation 1106 of Figure 11, etc.). Also, the system comprises logic for recognizing when the user selects content on a website displayed on the web browser and drops the content in the bucket (e.g. see operation 1108 of Figure 11, etc.). In addition, the system comprises logic for adding the selected content to the portal (e.g. see operation 1110 of Figure 11, etc.). See, for example, page 4, lines 3-7, 10-15, and 17-18 et al.

With respect to a summary of Claim 20, as shown in Figures 8-10 and 12, a method provides a multifunction toolbar for a web browser. In use, a toolbar (e.g. see item 800 of Figure 8, etc.) is displayed over a web browser (e.g. see item 1000 of Figure 10, etc.) on a computer, where the toolbar includes a sign on button for allowing a user to sign on to a system (e.g. see operation 1202 of Figure 12, etc.). Further, the toolbar is linked to a portal of a user on a remote server coupled to the computer via a network upon the user signing on (e.g. see operation 1204 of Figure 12, etc.). Further still, the portal is for aggregating content selected by the user. Also, additional features are presented on the toolbar upon the user signing in (e.g. see operation 1206 of Figure 12, etc.). In addition, one of the additional features is a bucket (e.g. see item 914 of Figure 9, etc.) presented on the toolbar. Furthermore, it is recognized when the user selects content on a website displayed on the web browser and drops the content in the bucket (e.g. see operation 1208 of Figure 12, etc.). Further still, the selected content is added to the portal (e.g. see operation 1210 of Figure 12, etc.). See, for example, page 4, line 22 – page 5, line 3 et al.

With respect to a summary of Claim 28, as shown in Figures 8-10 and 12, a computer program product provides a multifunction toolbar for a web browser. The computer program product comprises computer code for displaying a toolbar (e.g. see item 800 of Figure 8, etc.) over a web browser (e.g. see item 1000 of Figure 10, etc.) on a computer, where the toolbar includes a sign on button for allowing a user to sign on to a system (e.g. see operation 1202 of Figure 12, etc.). Further, the computer program product comprises computer code for linking the toolbar to a

portal of a user on a remote server coupled to the computer via a network upon the user signing in (e.g. see operation 1204 of Figure 12, etc.). Further still, the portal is for aggregating content selected by the user. Also, the computer program product comprises computer code for presenting additional features on the toolbar upon the user signing in (e.g. see operation 1206 of Figure 12, etc.). In addition, one of the additional features is a bucket (e.g. see item 914 of Figure 9, etc.) presented on the toolbar. Furthermore, the computer program product comprises computer code for recognizing when the user selects content on a website displayed on the web browser and drops the content in the bucket (e.g. see operation 1208 of Figure 12, etc.). Further still, the computer program product comprises computer code for adding the selected content to the portal (e.g. see operation 1210 of Figure 12, etc.). See, for example, page 4, line 22 – page 5, line 3 et al.

With respect to a summary of Claim 36, as shown in Figures 8-10 and 12, a system provides a multifunction toolbar for a web browser. The system comprises logic for displaying a toolbar (e.g. see item 800 of Figure 8, etc.) over a web browser (e.g. see item 1000 of Figure 10, etc.) on a computer, where the toolbar includes a sign on button for allowing a user to sign on to a system (e.g. see operation 1202 of Figure 12, etc.). Further, the system comprises logic for linking the toolbar to a portal of a user on a remote server coupled to the computer via a network upon the user signing in (e.g. see operation 1204 of Figure 12, etc.). Further still, the portal is for aggregating content selected by the user. Also, the system comprises logic for presenting additional features on the toolbar upon the user signing in (e.g. see operation 1206 of Figure 12, etc.). In addition, one of the additional features is a bucket (e.g. see item 914 of Figure 9, etc.) presented on the toolbar. Furthermore, the system comprises logic for recognizing when the user selects content on a website displayed on the web browser and drops the content in the bucket (e.g. see operation 1208 of Figure 12, etc.). Further still, the system comprises logic for adding the selected content to the portal (e.g. see operation 1210 of Figure 12, etc.). See, for example, page 4, line 22 – page 5, line 3 et al.

With respect to a summary of Claim 37, as shown in Figures 8-10 and 12, a method provides a multifunction toolbar for a web browser. In use, a toolbar (e.g. see item 800 of Figure 8, etc.) is displayed over a web browser (e.g. see item 1000 of Figure 10, etc.) on a computer, where the toolbar includes a sign on button for allowing a user to sign on to a system (e.g. see operation

1202 of Figure 12, etc.). Further, the toolbar is linked to a portal of a user on a remote server coupled to the computer via a network upon the user signing in (e.g. see operation 1204 of Figure 12, etc.). Further still, the portal is for aggregating content selected by the user. Also, additional features are presented on the toolbar upon the user signing in (e.g. see operation 1206 of Figure 12, etc.). In addition, the toolbar includes a bucket (e.g. see item 914 of Figure 9, etc.). Furthermore, it is recognized when the user selects content on a website displayed on the web browser and drops the content in the bucket (e.g. see operation 1208 of Figure 12, etc.). Further still, the selected content is added to the portal (e.g. see operation 1210 of Figure 12, etc.).

Also, the toolbar includes a customize button (e.g. see item 806 of Figure 8, etc.). Additionally, a customization screen is opened upon selection of the customize button. Further, features of the toolbar can be manipulated using the customization screen. Further still, the toolbar includes a headlines button (e.g. see item 906 of Figure 9, etc.), wherein headlines of the portal are displayed on the web browser upon selection of the headlines button. Also, the toolbar includes an email button (e.g. see item 904 of Figure 9, etc.), wherein email messages of the user are displayed upon selection of the email button. In addition, the toolbar includes a bookmark button (e.g. see item 902 of Figure 9, etc.) wherein bookmarks are displayed upon selection of the bookmark button. Furthermore, the toolbar includes a synchronize bookmark button, wherein the bookmarks are synchronized upon selection of the synchronize bookmark button. Further still, the toolbar includes a search field (e.g. see item 908 of Figure 9, etc.), wherein search results are displayed upon entry of a search term in the search field. Also, the toolbar includes a color button (e.g. see item 916 of Figure 9, etc.), wherein the user is allowed to change the color of the toolbar upon selection of the color button. See, for example, page 4, lines 22-26; page 5, lines 1-3, 5-10, 13-17, and 21-14 et al.

With respect to a summary of Claim 38, as shown in Figures 8, 10, and 12, a method is provided. In use, a toolbar (e.g. see item 800 of Figure 8, etc.) is displayed in association with a web browser (e.g. see item 1000 of Figure 10, etc.) on a computer, where the toolbar includes a sign on button for allowing a user to sign on to a system (e.g. see operation 1202 of Figure 12, etc.). Further, the toolbar is linked to a portal of the user on a remote server coupled to the computer via a network upon the user signing on (e.g. see operation 1204 of Figure 12, etc.). Further still, the portal is for aggregating content selected by the user. Also, additional features are provided

on the toolbar upon the user signing in (e.g. see operation 1206 of Figure 12, etc.). In addition, one of the additional features is in association with an icon presented on the toolbar. Furthermore, it is recognized when the user selects, in association with the icon, content of a website displayed on the web browser. Further still, the selected content is added to the portal (e.g. see operation 1210 of Figure 12, etc.). See, for example, page 4, lines 13-15, 17-18, and 22-26 et al.

Of course, the above citations are merely examples of the above claim language and should not be construed as limiting in any manner.

## VI GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vi))

Following, under each issue listed, is a concise statement setting forth the corresponding ground of rejection.

Issue # 1: The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, 10, 12, 14-16, 18, 19, and 39-41 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferguson (U.S. Patent No. 6,769,019) in view of Sheldon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,072,486), and in further view of Anuff et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0029296).

Issue # 2: The Examiner has rejected Claims 2, 11, 20, 21, 23-25, 27-29, 31-33, 35, 36, and 38 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferguson (U.S. Patent No. 6,769,019), in view of Sheldon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,072,486), in view of Anuff et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0029296), and in further view of Bascom et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,139,974).

Issue # 3: The Examiner has rejected Claims 4 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferguson (U.S. Patent No. 6,769,019), in view of Sheldon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,072,486), in view of Anuff et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0029296), and in further view of Schultz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,453,339).

Issue # 4: The Examiner has rejected Claims 22 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferguson (U.S. Patent No. 6,769,019), in view of Sheldon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,072,486), in view of Anuff et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0029296), in view of Bascom et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,139,974), and in further view of Schultz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,453,339).

Issue # 5: The Examiner has rejected Claims 8 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferguson (U.S. Patent No. 6,769,019), in view of Sheldon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,072,486), in view of Anuff et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0029296), and in further view of Shafron (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0165007).

Issue # 6: The Examiner has rejected Claims 26 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferguson (U.S. Patent No. 6,769,019), in view of Sheldon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,072,486), in view of Anuff et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0029296), in view of Bascom et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,139,974), and in further view of Shafron (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0165007).

Issue # 7: The Examiner has rejected Claim 37 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferguson (U.S. Patent No. 6,769,019), in view of Sheldon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,072,486), in view of Anuff et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0029296), in view of Bascom et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,139,974), in view of Shafron (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0165007), and in further view of Schultz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,453,339).

**VII ARGUMENT (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vii))**

The claims of the groups noted below do not stand or fall together. In the present section, appellant explains why the claims of each group are believed to be separately patentable.

Issue # 1:

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1, 3, 5-7, 9, 10, 12, 14-16, 18, 19, and 39-41 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferguson (U.S. Patent No. 6,769,019) in view of Sheldon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,072,486), and in further view of Anuff et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0029296).

*Group #1: Claims 1, 5-7, 9, 10, 14-16, 18, 19, and 40*

With respect to independent claims 1, 10, and 19, and particularly appellant's claimed "linking the toolbar to a portal of a user," the Examiner has admitted that "Ferguson fails to explicitly teach the linking of a portal of a user to a toolbar."

The Examiner has argued, however, that "Sheldon teaches a system and method for use with web browser toolbars, similar to those of Ferguson," and that "Sheldon teaches the ability to customize the toolbar of a user interface by adding, deleting, or changing the function of an associated button (col. 1, lines 44-48), or further, dragging and dropping components into a toolbar or deskbar, as can be seen in col. 19, line 61 through col. 20, line 14, as the user can drag an address bar (similar to the bucket of Ferguson, as input is entered into the bar resulting in a desired output) into any deskbar." The Examiner has also argued that "Sheldon further states that the deskbar may be placed in an application window, such as a web browser, at col. 6, lines 62-65." The Examiner has thus concluded that "the incorporation of the GUI 246, and its link to the displayed portal in Ferguson, is made possible by the toolbar customization of Sheldon."

Appellant respectfully disagrees and asserts that only generally teaching "toolbars [that] can be modified by adding or deleting buttons, or by changing the function associated with a button" (Col. 1, lines 44-46), as in Sheldon, fails to even suggest, let alone specifically meet appellant's

claimed "linking the toolbar to a portal of a user" (emphasis added), as claimed. In addition, appellant respectfully points out that Sheldon does not teach that "the user can drag an address bar...into any deskbar," as noted by the Examiner. Instead, Sheldon simply discloses that a "user can drag and drop a toolbar associated with [an] application window on some other area...on the display screen 300," such that "a deskbar is automatically created containing the toolbar" (see Col. 20, lines 1-6), which clearly only relates to creating a deskbar that contains a selected toolbar. Appellant respectfully asserts that only generally disclosing a technique for creating a deskbar that contains a selected toolbar, as in Sheldon, fails to specifically teach "**linking** the toolbar to a portal of a user" (emphasis added), as claimed.

Still yet, Sheldon's disclosure of a "deskbar [that] may simultaneously contain toolbars and toolbar components..., and [that] may exist in an application window" (Col. 6, lines 62-65), as referenced by the Examiner, only suggests allowing a deskbar to exist in an application window, which does meet appellant's claimed "**linking** the toolbar to a portal of a user" (emphasis added), as claimed.

Moreover, appellant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's argument that "incorporation of the GUI 246, and its link to the displayed portal in Ferguson, is made possible by the toolbar customization of Sheldon." Appellant respectfully notes that the Examiner has expressly relied on the GUI 246 in Ferguson to meet appellant's claimed portal, as expressed by the Examiner's statement that "the open GUI [is] analogous to the claimed 'portal'" (see Page 2 of the Office Action). Since the Examiner has relied on the GUI 246 in Ferguson to meet appellant's claimed portal, such GUI clearly cannot have a "link to the displayed portal in Ferguson" (emphasis added), as noted by the Examiner.

Additionally, it appears that the Examiner has relied on an inherency argument regarding the above emphasized claim limitations. In view of the arguments made hereinabove, any such inherency argument has been adequately rebutted, and a notice of allowance or a specific prior art showing of such claim features, in combination with the remaining claim elements is respectfully requested. (See MPEP 2112)

Further, in response, appellant asserts that the fact that a certain result or characteristic may occur or be present in the prior art is not sufficient to establish the inherency of that result or characteristic. In re Rijckaert, 9 F.3d 1531, 1534, 28 USPQ2d 1955, 1957 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Oelrich, 666 F.2d 578, 581-82, 212 USPQ 323, 326 (CCPA 1981). "To establish inherency, the extrinsic evidence 'must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described in the reference, and that it would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill. Inherency, however, may not be established by probabilities or possibilities. The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient.'" In re Robertson, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950-51 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

Still yet, the Examiner has argued that "[a]s the bucket of Ferguson is linked to the user portal, any incorporation of the bucket into a toolbar (as done by Sheldon) therefore links the toolbar to the user portal."

Appellant respectfully disagrees and again points out that Sheldon merely discloses that a "user can drag and drop a toolbar associated with [an] application window on some other area...on the display screen 300," such that "a deskbar is automatically created containing the toolbar" (see Col. 20, lines 1-6), which clearly only relates to creating a deskbar that contains a selected toolbar. Appellant respectfully asserts that merely allowing a user to drag and drop a toolbar on some area of a display screen, where a deskbar containing the toolbar is created, as in Sheldon, fails to support the Examiner's allegation that Sheldon teaches "incorporation of the bucket into a toolbar" (emphasis added). To this end, the excerpts from Ferguson and Sheldon, as relied on by the Examiner, do not meet "linking the toolbar to a portal of a user," as claimed.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed.Cir.1991).

Appellant respectfully asserts that at least the third element of the *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been met, since the prior art excerpts, as relied upon by the Examiner, fail to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations, as noted above.

*Group #2: Claims 3 and 12*

With respect to independent Claim 3 et al., the Examiner has relied on Col. 1, lines 44-48 in Sheldon to make a prior art showing of appellant's claimed technique "wherein the toolbar includes a customize button, wherein a customization screen is opened upon selection of the customize button, wherein features of the toolbar can be manipulated using the customization screen."

Appellant respectfully notes that the above excerpt relied on by the Examiner merely states that "the toolbars can be modified by adding or deleting buttons, or by changing the function associated with a button" (Col. 1, lines 44-46). However, simply describing that toolbars can be modified by adding or deleting buttons and changing button function, as in Sheldon, fails to disclose "a customize button," much less a technique "wherein the toolbar includes a customize button, wherein a customization screen is opened upon selection of the customize button, wherein features of the toolbar can be manipulated using the customization screen" (emphasis added), as claimed by appellant.

Again, appellant respectfully asserts that at least the third element of the *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been met, since the prior art excerpts, as relied upon by the Examiner, fail to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations, as noted above.

*Group #3: Claim 39*

With respect to dependent Claim 39, the Examiner has only generally stated that "Ferguson and Sheldon teach adding functionality to a toolbar or deskbar, where that functionality may be the bucket of Ferguson, or a button with similar functionality, as taught above by Sheldon," to make

a prior art showing of appellant's claimed technique "wherein the bucket includes a button on the toolbar."

Appellant respectfully asserts that Sheldon only generally discloses that "toolbars can be modified by...changing the function associated with the button" (Col. 1, lines 44-46). Clearly, such a general disclosure does not even suggest any sort of "bucket," as appellant claims. Further, Ferguson merely discloses "dragging-&-dropping hyperlinks on the interface 246 of the invention" (Col. 6, lines 64-65), where such interface 246 is clearly not a button, as shown in Figure 8 of Ferguson. Thus, neither Sheldon nor Ferguson, as relied on by the Examiner, meet appellant's claimed "bucket [that] includes a **button on the toolbar**" (emphasis added), as claimed.

Again, appellant respectfully asserts that at least the third element of the *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been met, since the prior art excerpts, as relied upon by the Examiner, fail to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations, as noted above.

*Group #4: Claim 41*

With respect to independent Claim 41, the Examiner has relied on Paragraph [0006] in Anuff to make a prior art showing of appellant's claimed technique "wherein adding the selected content to the portal includes storing the content on the remote server."

Appellant respectfully notes that the above excerpt relied on by the Examiner merely states that "the portal server presents an initial view, or front page, that comprises a plurality of modules that are formatted in a predetermined layout," that "[e]ach module represents a resource that can be accessed by the user through the portal," and that "[t]he modular nature of the portal enables the various resources to be readily and independently updated by the entities who provide them" (Paragraph [0006]).

However, merely disclosing that a portal comprises modules that represent resources accessible to the user through the portal, and that the resources may be updated by the entities who provide them, as in Anuff, does not disclose a remote server, much less a technique "wherein adding the

selected content to the portal includes storing the content on the remote server" (emphasis added), as specifically claimed.

Again, appellant respectfully asserts that at least the third element of the *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been met, since the prior art excerpts, as relied upon by the Examiner, fail to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations, as noted above.

Issue # 2:

The Examiner has rejected Claims 2, 11, 20, 21, 23-25, 27-29, 31-33, 35, 36, and 38 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferguson (U.S. Patent No. 6,769,019), in view of Sheldon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,072,486), in view of Anuff et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0029296), and in further view of Bascom et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,139,974).

*Group #1: Claims 20, 21, 23-25, 27-29, 31-33, 35, and 36*

With respect to independent Claims 20, 28, and 36, and particularly appellant's claimed "linking the toolbar to a portal of a user" (see the same or similar, but not necessarily identical language in the independent claims), the Examiner has admitted that "Ferguson fails to explicitly teach the linking of a portal of a user to a toolbar."

The Examiner has argued, however, that "Sheldon teaches a system and method for use with web browser toolbars, similar to those of Ferguson," and that "Sheldon teaches the ability to customize the toolbar of a user interface by adding, deleting, or changing the function of an associated button (col. 1, lines 44-48), or further, dragging and dropping components into a toolbar or deskbar, as can be seen in col. 19, line 61 through col. 20, line 14, as the user can drag an address bar (similar to the bucket of Ferguson, as input is entered into the bar resulting in a desired output) into any deskbar." The Examiner has also argued that "Sheldon further states that the deskbar may be placed in an application window, such as a web browser, at col. 6, lines 62-65." The Examiner has thus concluded that "the incorporation of the GUI 246, and its link to the displayed portal in Ferguson, is made possible by the toolbar customization of Sheldon."

Appellant respectfully disagrees and asserts that only generally teaching "toolbars [that] can be modified by adding or deleting buttons, or by changing the function associated with a button" (Col. 1, lines 44-46), as in Sheldon, fails to even suggest, let alone specifically meet appellant's claimed "linking the toolbar to a portal of a user" (emphasis added), as claimed. In addition, appellant respectfully points out that Sheldon does not teach that "the user can drag an address bar...into any deskbar," as noted by the Examiner. Instead, Sheldon simply discloses that a "user can drag and drop a toolbar associated with [an] application window on some other area...on the display screen 300," such that "a deskbar is automatically created containing the toolbar" (see Col. 20, lines 1-6), which clearly only relates to creating a deskbar that contains a selected toolbar. Appellant respectfully asserts that only generally disclosing a technique for creating a deskbar that contains a selected toolbar, as in Sheldon, fails to specifically teach "**linking** the toolbar to a portal of a user" (emphasis added), as claimed.

Still yet, Sheldon's disclosure of a "deskbar [that] may simultaneously contain toolbars and toolbar components..., and [that] may exist in an application window" (Col. 6, lines 62-65), as referenced by the Examiner, only suggests allowing a deskbar to exist in an application window, which does meet appellant's claimed "**linking** the toolbar to a portal of a user" (emphasis added), as claimed.

Moreover, appellant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's argument that "incorporation of the GUI 246, and its link to the displayed portal in Ferguson, is made possible by the toolbar customization of Sheldon." Appellant respectfully notes that the Examiner has expressly relied on the GUI 246 in Ferguson to meet appellant's claimed portal, as expressed by the Examiner's statement that "the open GUI [is] analogous to the claimed 'portal'" (see Page 2 of the Office Action). Since the Examiner has relied on the GUI 246 in Ferguson to meet appellant's claimed portal, such GUI clearly cannot have a "link to the displayed portal in Ferguson" (emphasis added), as noted by the Examiner.

Additionally, it appears that the Examiner has relied on an inherency argument regarding the above emphasized claim limitations. In view of the arguments made hereinabove, any such inherency argument has been adequately rebutted, and a notice of allowance or a specific prior

art showing of such claim features, in combination with the remaining claim elements is respectfully requested. (See MPEP 2112)

Further, in response, appellant asserts that the fact that a certain result or characteristic may occur or be present in the prior art is not sufficient to establish the inherency of that result or characteristic. In re Rijckaert, 9 F.3d 1531, 1534, 28 USPQ2d 1955, 1957 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Oelrich, 666 F.2d 578, 581-82, 212 USPQ 323, 326 (CCPA 1981). "To establish inherency, the extrinsic evidence 'must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described in the reference, and that it would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill. Inherency, however, may not be established by probabilities or possibilities. The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient.'" In re Robertson, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950-51 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

Still yet, the Examiner has argued that "[a]s the bucket of Ferguson is linked to the user portal, any incorporation of the bucket into a toolbar (as done by Sheldon) therefore links the toolbar to the user portal."

Appellant respectfully disagrees and again points out that Sheldon merely discloses that a "user can drag and drop a toolbar associated with [an] application window on some other area...on the display screen 300," such that "a deskbar is automatically created containing the toolbar" (see Col. 20, lines 1-6), which clearly only relates to creating a deskbar that contains a selected toolbar. Appellant respectfully asserts that merely allowing a user to drag and drop a toolbar on some area of a display screen, where a deskbar containing the toolbar is created, as in Sheldon, fails to support the Examiner's allegation that Sheldon teaches "incorporation of the bucket into a toolbar" (emphasis added). To this end, the excerpts from Ferguson and Sheldon, as relied on by the Examiner, do not meet "linking the toolbar to a portal of a user," as claimed.

Again, appellant respectfully asserts that at least the third element of the *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been met, since the prior art excerpts, as relied upon by the Examiner, fail to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations, as noted above.

*Group #2: Claims 2 and 11*

With respect to dependent Claim 2 et al., the Examiner has again relied on Col. 21, lines 3-6 from the Bascom reference to make a prior art showing of appellant's claimed "toolbar [that] includes a sign on button, wherein the toolbar links to the portal upon the user signing in." Specifically, the Examiner has argued that "Bascom teaches the use of sign on buttons in a web browser toolbar to allow access to secure information."

First, appellant respectfully asserts that merely allowing access to secure information, as noted by the Examiner, fails to rise to the level of specificity of appellant's claimed "**toolbar** [that] links to the portal upon the user signing in" (emphasis added), as claimed. Second, appellant respectfully asserts that the excerpt from Bascom relied on by the Examiner only generally discloses that a "client logon button 1050 initiates a connection between the client tool 220 and one or more servers 30." Appellant notes that such excerpt further teaches that "[t]he client toolbar 1010 includes a number of GUI buttons that initiate various functions of the client tool 220" (emphasis added). Clearly, Bascom only discloses connecting a client tool to a server, and not a "**toolbar** [that] links to the portal upon the user signing in" (emphasis added), as claimed.

Again, appellant respectfully asserts that at least the third element of the *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been met, since the prior art excerpts, as relied upon by the Examiner, fail to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations, as noted above.

*Group #3: Claim 38*

With respect to independent Claim 38, and particularly appellant's claimed "linking the toolbar to a portal of a user" (see the same or similar, but not necessarily identical language in the independent claims), the Examiner has admitted that "Ferguson fails to explicitly teach the linking of a portal of a user to a toolbar."

The Examiner has argued, however, that "Sheldon teaches a system and method for use with web browser toolbars, similar to those of Ferguson," and that "Sheldon teaches the ability to customize the toolbar of a user interface by adding, deleting, or changing the function of an associated button (col. 1, lines 44-48), or further, dragging and dropping components into a

toolbar or deskbar, as can be seen in col. 19, line 61 through col. 20, line 14, as the user can drag an address bar (similar to the bucket of Ferguson, as input is entered into the bar resulting in a desired output) into any deskbar." The Examiner has also argued that "Sheldon further states that the deskbar may be placed in an application window, such as a web browser, at col. 6, lines 62-65." The Examiner has thus concluded that "the incorporation of the GUI 246, and its link to the displayed portal in Ferguson, is made possible by the toolbar customization of Sheldon."

Appellant respectfully disagrees and asserts that only generally teaching "toolbars [that] can be modified by adding or deleting buttons, or by changing the function associated with a button" (Col. 1, lines 44-46), as in Sheldon, fails to even suggest, let alone specifically meet appellant's claimed "linking the toolbar to a portal of a user" (emphasis added), as claimed. In addition, appellant respectfully points out that Sheldon does not teach that "the user can drag an address bar...into any deskbar," as noted by the Examiner. Instead, Sheldon simply discloses that a "user can drag and drop a toolbar associated with [an] application window on some other area...on the display screen 300," such that "a deskbar is automatically created containing the toolbar" (see Col. 20, lines 1-6), which clearly only relates to creating a deskbar that contains a selected toolbar. Appellant respectfully asserts that only generally disclosing a technique for creating a deskbar that contains a selected toolbar, as in Sheldon, fails to specifically teach "**linking** the toolbar to a portal of a user" (emphasis added), as claimed.

Still yet, Sheldon's disclosure of a "deskbar [that] may simultaneously contain toolbars and toolbar components..., and [that] may exist in an application window" (Col. 6, lines 62-65), as referenced by the Examiner, only suggests allowing a deskbar to exist in an application window, which does meet appellant's claimed "**linking** the toolbar to a portal of a user" (emphasis added), as claimed.

Moreover, appellant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's argument that "incorporation of the GUI 246, and its link to the displayed portal in Ferguson, is made possible by the toolbar customization of Sheldon." Appellant respectfully notes that the Examiner has expressly relied on the GUI 246 in Ferguson to meet appellant's claimed portal, as expressed by the Examiner's statement that "the open GUI [is] analogous to the claimed 'portal'" (see Page 2 of the Office Action). Since the Examiner has relied on the GUI 246 in Ferguson to meet appellant's claimed

portal, such GUI clearly cannot have a "link to the displayed portal in Ferguson" (emphasis added), as noted by the Examiner.

Additionally, it appears that the Examiner has relied on an inherency argument regarding the above emphasized claim limitations. In view of the arguments made hereinabove, any such inherency argument has been adequately rebutted, and a notice of allowance or a specific prior art showing of such claim features, in combination with the remaining claim elements is respectfully requested. (See MPEP 2112)

Further, in response, appellant asserts that the fact that a certain result or characteristic may occur or be present in the prior art is not sufficient to establish the inherency of that result or characteristic. In re Rijckaert, 9 F.3d 1531, 1534, 28 USPQ2d 1955, 1957 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Oelrich, 666 F.2d 578, 581-82, 212 USPQ 323, 326 (CCPA 1981). "To establish inherency, the extrinsic evidence 'must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described in the reference, and that it would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill. Inherency, however, may not be established by probabilities or possibilities. The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient.'" In re Robertson, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950-51 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

Still yet, the Examiner has argued that "[a]s the bucket of Ferguson is linked to the user portal, any incorporation of the bucket into a toolbar (as done by Sheldon) therefore links the toolbar to the user portal."

Appellant respectfully disagrees and again points out that Sheldon merely discloses that a "user can drag and drop a toolbar associated with [an] application window on some other area...on the display screen 300," such that "a deskbar is automatically created containing the toolbar" (see Col. 20, lines 1-6), which clearly only relates to creating a deskbar that contains a selected toolbar. Appellant respectfully asserts that merely allowing a user to drag and drop a toolbar on some area of a display screen, where a deskbar containing the toolbar is created, as in Sheldon, fails to support the Examiner's allegation that Sheldon teaches "incorporation of the bucket into a toolbar" (emphasis added). To this end, the excerpts from Ferguson and Sheldon, as relied on by the Examiner, do not meet "linking the toolbar to a portal of a user," as claimed.

Further, with respect to independent Claim 38, appellant notes the Examiner has relied on Col. 21, lines 3-6 from the Bascom reference to make a prior art showing of appellant's claimed "linking the toolbar to a portal of the user on a remote server coupled to the computer via network upon the user signing on." Specifically, the Examiner has argued that "Bascom teaches the use of sign on buttons in a web browser toolbar to allow access to secure information."

First, appellant respectfully asserts that merely allowing access to secure information, as noted by the Examiner, fails to rise to the level of specificity of appellant's claimed "linking the **toolbar** to a portal of the user on a remote server coupled to the computer via network upon the user signing on" (emphasis added), as claimed. Second, appellant respectfully asserts that the excerpt from Bascom relied on by the Examiner only generally discloses that a "client logon button 1050 initiates a connection between the client tool 220 and one or more servers 30." Appellant notes that such excerpt further teaches that "[t]he client toolbar 1010 includes a number of GUI buttons that initiate various functions of the client tool 220" (emphasis added). Clearly, Bascom only discloses connecting a client tool to a server, and not "linking the **toolbar** to a portal of the user...upon the user signing on" (emphasis added), as claimed.

Again, appellant respectfully asserts that at least the third element of the *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been met, since the prior art excerpts, as relied upon by the Examiner, fail to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations, as noted above.

Issue # 3:

The Examiner has rejected Claims 4 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferguson (U.S. Patent No. 6,769,019), in view of Sheldon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,072,486), in view of Anuff et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0029296), and in further view of Schultz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,453,339).

*Group #1: Claims 4 and 13*

Appellant respectfully asserts that such claims are not met by the prior art for the reasons argued with respect to Issue #1, Group #1.

Issue # 4:

The Examiner has rejected Claims 22 and 30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferguson (U.S. Patent No. 6,769,019), in view of Sheldon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,072,486), in view of Anuff et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0029296), in view of Bascom et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,139,974), and in further view of Schultz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,453,339).

*Group #1: Claims 22 and 30*

Appellant respectfully asserts that such claims are not met by the prior art for the reasons argued with respect to Issue #2, Group #1.

Issue # 5:

The Examiner has rejected Claims 8 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferguson (U.S. Patent No. 6,769,019), in view of Sheldon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,072,486), in view of Anuff et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0029296), and in further view of Shafron (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0165007).

*Group #1: Claims 8 and 17*

Appellant respectfully asserts that such claims are not met by the prior art for the reasons argued with respect to Issue #1, Group #1.

Issue # 6:

The Examiner has rejected Claims 26 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferguson (U.S. Patent No. 6,769,019), in view of Sheldon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,072,486), in

view of Anuff et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0029296), in view of Bascom et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,139,974), and in further view of Shafron (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0165007).

*Group #1: Claims 26 and 34*

Appellant respectfully asserts that such claims are not met by the prior art for the reasons argued with respect to Issue #2, Group #1.

Issue # 7:

The Examiner has rejected Claim 37 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferguson (U.S. Patent No. 6,769,019), in view of Sheldon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,072,486), in view of Anuff et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0029296), in view of Bascom et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,139,974), in view of Shafron (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0165007), and in further view of Schultz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,453,339).

*Group #1: Claim 37*

With respect to independent Claim 37, and particularly appellant's claimed "linking the toolbar to a portal of a user," the Examiner has admitted that "Ferguson fails to explicitly teach the linking of a portal of a user to a toolbar."

The Examiner has argued, however, that "Sheldon teaches a system and method for use with web browser toolbars, similar to those of Ferguson," and that "Sheldon teaches the ability to customize the toolbar of a user interface by adding, deleting, or changing the function of an associated button (col. 1, lines 44-48), or further, dragging and dropping components into a toolbar or deskbar, as can be seen in col. 19, line 61 through col. 20, line 14, as the user can drag an address bar (similar to the bucket of Ferguson, as input is entered into the bar resulting in a desired output) into any deskbar." The Examiner has also argued that "Sheldon further states that the deskbar may be placed in an application window, such as a web browser, at col. 6, lines 62-65." The Examiner has thus concluded that "the incorporation of the GUI 246, and its link to the displayed portal in Ferguson, is made possible by the toolbar customization of Sheldon."

Appellant respectfully disagrees and asserts that only generally teaching "toolbars [that] can be modified by adding or deleting buttons, or by changing the function associated with a button" (Col. 1, lines 44-46), as in Sheldon, fails to even suggest, let alone specifically meet appellant's claimed "linking the toolbar to a portal of a user" (emphasis added), as claimed. In addition, appellant respectfully points out that Sheldon does not teach that "the user can drag an address bar...into any deskbar," as noted by the Examiner. Instead, Sheldon simply discloses that a "user can drag and drop a toolbar associated with [an] application window on some other area...on the display screen 300," such that "a deskbar is automatically created containing the toolbar" (see Col. 20, lines 1-6), which clearly only relates to creating a deskbar that contains a selected toolbar. Appellant respectfully asserts that only generally disclosing a technique for creating a deskbar that contains a selected toolbar, as in Sheldon, fails to specifically teach "**linking** the toolbar to a portal of a user" (emphasis added), as claimed.

Still yet, Sheldon's disclosure of a "deskbar [that] may simultaneously contain toolbars and toolbar components..., and [that] may exist in an application window" (Col. 6, lines 62-65), as referenced by the Examiner, only suggests allowing a deskbar to exist in an application window, which does meet appellant's claimed "**linking** the toolbar to a portal of a user" (emphasis added), as claimed.

Moreover, appellant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's argument that "incorporation of the GUI 246, and its link to the displayed portal in Ferguson, is made possible by the toolbar customization of Sheldon." Appellant respectfully notes that the Examiner has expressly relied on the GUI 246 in Ferguson to meet appellant's claimed portal, as expressed by the Examiner's statement that "the open GUI [is] analogous to the claimed 'portal'" (see Page 2 of the Office Action). Since the Examiner has relied on the GUI 246 in Ferguson to meet appellant's claimed portal, such GUI clearly cannot have a "link to the displayed portal in Ferguson" (emphasis added), as noted by the Examiner.

Additionally, it appears that the Examiner has relied on an inherency argument regarding the above emphasized claim limitations. In view of the arguments made hereinabove, any such inherency argument has been adequately rebutted, and a notice of allowance or a specific prior

art showing of such claim features, in combination with the remaining claim elements is respectfully requested. (See MPEP 2112)

Further, in response, appellant asserts that the fact that a certain result or characteristic may occur or be present in the prior art is not sufficient to establish the inherency of that result or characteristic. In re Rijckaert, 9 F.3d 1531, 1534, 28 USPQ2d 1955, 1957 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Oelrich, 666 F.2d 578, 581-82, 212 USPQ 323, 326 (CCPA 1981). "To establish inherency, the extrinsic evidence 'must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described in the reference, and that it would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill. Inherency, however, may not be established by probabilities or possibilities. The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient.'" In re Robertson, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950-51 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

Still yet, the Examiner has argued that "[a]s the bucket of Ferguson is linked to the user portal, any incorporation of the bucket into a toolbar (as done by Sheldon) therefore links the toolbar to the user portal."

Appellant respectfully disagrees and again points out that Sheldon merely discloses that a "user can drag and drop a toolbar associated with [an] application window on some other area...on the display screen 300," such that "a deskbar is automatically created containing the toolbar" (see Col. 20, lines 1-6), which clearly only relates to creating a deskbar that contains a selected toolbar. Appellant respectfully asserts that merely allowing a user to drag and drop a toolbar on some area of a display screen, where a deskbar containing the toolbar is created, as in Sheldon, fails to support the Examiner's allegation that Sheldon teaches "incorporation of the bucket into a toolbar" (emphasis added). To this end, the excerpts from Ferguson and Sheldon, as relied on by the Examiner, do not meet "linking the toolbar to a portal of a user," as claimed.

Again, appellant respectfully asserts that at least the third element of the *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been met, since the prior art excerpts, as relied upon by the Examiner, fail to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations, as noted above.

In view of the remarks set forth hereinabove, all of the independent claims are deemed allowable, along with any claims depending therefrom.

## VIII CLAIMS APPENDIX (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(viii))

The text of the claims involved in the appeal (along with associated status information) is set forth below:

1. (PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED) A method for providing a multifunction toolbar for a web browser, comprising:

displaying a toolbar over a web browser on a computer;

linking the toolbar to a portal of a user on a remote server coupled to the computer via a network, wherein the portal is for aggregating content selected by the user;

presenting a bucket on the toolbar;

recognizing when the user selects content on a website displayed on the web browser and drops the content in the bucket; and

adding the selected content to the portal.

2. (ORIGINAL) A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the toolbar includes a sign on button, wherein the toolbar links to the portal upon the user signing in.

3. (ORIGINAL) A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the toolbar includes a customize button, wherein a customization screen is opened upon selection of the customize button, wherein features of the toolbar can be manipulated using the customization screen.

4. (ORIGINAL) A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the toolbar includes a headlines button, wherein headlines of the portal are displayed on the web browser upon selection of the headlines button.

5. (ORIGINAL) A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the toolbar includes an email button, wherein email messages of the user are displayed upon selection of the email button.

6. (ORIGINAL) A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the toolbar includes a bookmark button, wherein bookmarks are displayed upon selection of the bookmark button.

7. (ORIGINAL) A method as recited in claim 6, wherein the toolbar includes a synchronize bookmark button, wherein the bookmarks are synchronized upon selection of the synchronize bookmark button.

8. (ORIGINAL) A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the toolbar includes a search field, wherein search results are displayed upon entry of a search term in the search field.

9. (ORIGINAL) A method as recited in claim 1, wherein the toolbar includes a color button, wherein the user is allowed to change the color of the toolbar upon selection of the color button.

10. (PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED) A computer program product for providing a multifunction toolbar for a web browser, comprising:

computer code for displaying a toolbar over a web browser on a computer;

computer code for linking the toolbar to a portal of a user on a remote server coupled to the computer via a network, wherein the portal is for aggregating content selected by the user;

computer code for presenting a bucket on the toolbar;

computer code for recognizing when the user selects content on a website displayed on the web browser and drops the content in the bucket; and

computer code for adding the selected content to the portal.

11. (ORIGINAL) A computer program product as recited in claim 10, wherein the toolbar includes a sign on button, wherein the toolbar links to the portal upon the user signing in.

12. (ORIGINAL) A computer program product as recited in claim 10, wherein the toolbar includes a customize button, wherein a customization screen is opened upon selection of the customize button, wherein features of the toolbar can be manipulated using the customization screen.

13. (ORIGINAL) A computer program product as recited in claim 10, wherein the toolbar includes a headlines button, wherein headlines of the portal are displayed on the web browser upon selection of the headlines button.

14. (ORIGINAL) A computer program product as recited in claim 10, wherein the toolbar includes an email button, wherein email messages of the user are displayed upon selection of the email button.

15. (ORIGINAL) A computer program product as recited in claim 10, wherein the toolbar includes a bookmark button, wherein bookmarks are displayed upon selection of the bookmark button.

16. (ORIGINAL) A computer program product as recited in claim 15, wherein the toolbar includes a synchronize bookmark button, wherein the bookmarks are synchronized upon selection of the synchronize bookmark button.

17. (ORIGINAL) A computer program product as recited in claim 10, wherein the toolbar includes a search field, wherein search results are displayed upon entry of a search term in the search field.

18. (ORIGINAL) A computer program product as recited in claim 10, wherein the toolbar includes a color button, wherein the user is allowed to change the color of the toolbar upon selection of the color button.

19. (PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED) A system for providing a multifunction toolbar for a web browser, comprising:

logic for displaying a toolbar over a web browser on a computer;

logic for linking the toolbar to a portal of a user on a remote server coupled to the computer via a network, wherein the portal is for aggregating content selected by the user;

logic for presenting a bucket on the toolbar;

logic for recognizing when the user selects content on a website displayed on the web browser and drops the content in the bucket; and

logic for adding the selected content to the portal.

20. (PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED) A method for providing a multifunction toolbar for a web browser, comprising:

displaying a toolbar over a web browser on a computer;

wherein the toolbar includes a sign on button for allowing a user to sign on to a system;

linking the toolbar to a portal of a user on a remote server coupled to the computer via a network upon the user signing on, wherein the portal is for aggregating content selected by the user;

presenting additional features on the toolbar upon the user signing in;

wherein one of the additional features is a bucket presented on the toolbar;

recognizing when the user selects content on a website displayed on the web browser and drops the content in the bucket; and

adding the selected content to the portal.

21. (ORIGINAL) A method as recited in claim 20, wherein the toolbar includes a customize button, wherein a customization screen is opened upon selection of the customize button, wherein features of the toolbar can be manipulated using the customization screen.

22. (ORIGINAL) A method as recited in claim 20, wherein the toolbar includes a headlines button, wherein headlines of the portal are displayed on the web browser upon selection of the headlines button.

23. (ORIGINAL) A method as recited in claim 20, wherein the toolbar includes an email button, wherein email messages of the user are displayed upon selection of the email button.

24. (ORIGINAL) A method as recited in claim 20, wherein the toolbar includes a bookmark button, wherein bookmarks are displayed upon selection of the bookmark button.

25. (ORIGINAL) A method as recited in claim 24, wherein the toolbar includes a synchronize bookmark button, wherein the bookmarks are synchronized upon selection of the synchronize bookmark button.

26. (ORIGINAL) A method as recited in claim 20, wherein the toolbar includes a search field, wherein search results are displayed upon entry of a search term in the search field.

27. (ORIGINAL) A method as recited in claim 20, wherein the toolbar includes a color button, wherein the user is allowed to change the color of the toolbar upon selection of the color button.

28. (PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED) A computer program product for providing a multifunction toolbar for a web browser, comprising:

computer code for displaying a toolbar over a web browser on a computer;

wherein the toolbar includes a sign on button for allowing a user to sign on to a system;

computer code for linking the toolbar to a portal of a user on a remote server coupled to the computer via a network upon the user signing in, wherein the portal is for aggregating content selected by the user;

computer code for presenting additional features on the toolbar upon the user signing in;

wherein one of the additional features is a bucket presented on the toolbar;

computer code for recognizing when the user selects content on a website displayed on the web browser and drops the content in the bucket; and

computer code for adding the selected content to the portal.

29. (ORIGINAL) A computer program product as recited in claim 28, wherein the toolbar includes a customize button, wherein a customization screen is opened upon selection of the customize button, wherein features of the toolbar can be manipulated using the customization screen.

30. (ORIGINAL) A computer program product as recited in claim 28, wherein the toolbar includes a headlines button, wherein headlines of the portal are displayed on the web browser upon selection of the headlines button.

31. (ORIGINAL) A computer program product as recited in claim 28, wherein the toolbar includes an email button, wherein email messages of the user are displayed upon selection of the email button.

32. (ORIGINAL) A computer program product as recited in claim 28, wherein the toolbar includes a bookmark button, wherein bookmarks are displayed upon selection of the bookmark button.

33. (ORIGINAL) A computer program product as recited in claim 32, wherein the toolbar includes a synchronize bookmark button, wherein the bookmarks are synchronized upon selection of the synchronize bookmark button.

34. (ORIGINAL) A computer program product as recited in claim 28, wherein the toolbar includes a search field, wherein search results are displayed upon entry of a search term in the search field.

35. (ORIGINAL) A computer program product as recited in claim 28, wherein the toolbar includes a color button, wherein the user is allowed to change the color of the toolbar upon selection of the color button.

36. (PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED) A system for providing a multifunction toolbar for a web browser, comprising:

logic for displaying a toolbar over a web browser on a computer;

wherein the toolbar includes a sign on button for allowing a user to sign on to a system;

logic for linking the toolbar to a portal of a user on a remote server coupled to the computer via a network upon the user signing in, wherein the portal is for aggregating content selected by the user;

logic for presenting additional features on the toolbar upon the user signing in;

wherein one of the additional features is a bucket presented on the toolbar;

logic for recognizing when the user selects content on a website displayed on the web browser and drops the content in the bucket; and

logic for adding the selected content to the portal.

37. (PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED) A method for providing a multifunction toolbar for a web browser, comprising:

displaying a toolbar over a web browser on a computer;

wherein the toolbar includes a sign on button for allowing a user to sign on to a system;

linking the toolbar to a portal of a user on a remote server coupled to the computer via a network upon the user signing in, wherein the portal is for aggregating content selected by the user;

presenting additional features on the toolbar upon the user signing in;

wherein the toolbar includes a bucket;

recognizing when the user selects content on a website displayed on the web browser and drops the content in the bucket; and

adding the selected content to the portal;

wherein the toolbar includes a customize button, wherein a customization screen is opened upon selection of the customize button, wherein features of the toolbar can be manipulated using the customization screen;

wherein the toolbar includes a headlines button, wherein headlines of the portal are displayed on the web browser upon selection of the headlines button;

wherein the toolbar includes an email button, wherein email messages of the user are displayed upon selection of the email button;

wherein the toolbar includes a bookmark button, wherein bookmarks are displayed upon selection of the bookmark button;

wherein the toolbar includes a synchronize bookmark button, wherein the bookmarks are synchronized upon selection of the synchronize bookmark button;

wherein the toolbar includes a search field, wherein search results are displayed upon entry of a search term in the search field;

wherein the toolbar includes a color button, wherein the user is allowed to change the color of the toolbar upon selection of the color button.

38. (PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED) A method, comprising:

displaying a toolbar in association with a web browser on a computer, the toolbar including a sign on button for allowing a user to sign on to a system;

linking the toolbar to a portal of the user on a remote server coupled to the computer via a network upon the user signing on, the portal being for aggregating content selected by the user;

providing additional features on the toolbar upon the user signing in, one of the additional features being in association with an icon presented on the toolbar;

recognizing when the user selects, in association with the icon, content of a website displayed on the web browser; and

adding the selected content to the portal.

39. (PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED) The method as recited in claim 1, wherein the bucket includes a button on the toolbar.

40. (PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED) The method as recited in claim 1, wherein the content includes at least one of video, audio, text and graphics.

41. (PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED) The method as recited in claim 1, wherein adding the selected content to the portal includes storing the content on the remote server.

## IX EVIDENCE APPENDIX (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(ix))

There is no such evidence.

## X RELATED PROCEEDING APPENDIX (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(x))

N/A

In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 971-2573. For payment of any additional fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1351 (Order No. NVIDP380).

Respectfully submitted,

By: /KEVINZILKA/ Date: February 25, 2008
Kevin J. Zilka
Reg. No. 41,429

Zilka-Kotab, P.C.
P.O. Box 721120
San Jose, California 95172-1120
Telephone: (408) 971-2573
Facsimile: (408) 971-4660